UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,475	09/26/2001	Karen Capers	2001P17432US	2798

7590 12/13/2005	**EXAMINER**
Siemens Corporation	NGUYEN, TUAN HOANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	

Siemens Corporation
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 September 2001</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

2.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 1, 5, 14-17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kinnunen et al. (U.S PUB. 2001/0021649 hereinafter, "Kinnunen") in

view of Baker et al. (U.S PAT. 6,317,597 hereinafter, "Baker").

Regarding claim 1, Kinnunen discloses in an office land mobile network (OLMN) system, a method for creating user interfaces for a plurality of users of said OLMN, the steps of said method comprising: receiving a request from said user for service from said OLMN, said request comprising data pertaining to said service (page 1 [0014]); validating said data received from said request (page 1 [0016]); and returning a user interface, said user interface being appropriate for the particular request received (page 1 [0004] and [0016]). Kinnunen differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching if said data is valid for said request, formatting said data into an internal format; submitting said formatted request to an appropriate framework for application processing. However, Baker teaches if said data is valid for said request, formatting said data into an internal format (col. 7 lines 3-13); submitting said formatted request to an appropriate framework for application processing (col. 7 lines 3-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kinnunen in if said data is valid for said request, formatting said data into an internal format; submitting said formatted request to an appropriate framework for application processing, as per teaching of Baker, because it provides methods and computer executable instructions for creating numeric dialing strings facilitating the wireless network dial-up session.

Regarding claim 5, Baker further discloses internal format comprises extensible markup language (col. 7 lines 3-13).

Regarding claim 14, Kinnunen further discloses requesting a list of valid

subscribers (page 1 [0016]); presenting an instant messaging screen comprising said

list of valid subscribers to said user (page 1 [0016]); collecting message text and

subscriber selection from said user (page 1 [0014]); submitting said instant message

request to an appropriate framework (page 1 [0015]).

Regarding claim 15, Kinnunen further discloses the step of receiving a request

from a user further comprises: receiving a request to logon to said OLMN system (page

1 [0014]); sending said request to logon to an appropriate framework (page 1 [0015]);

and if said logon request is valid, return a reference to new session for said user (page

1 [0016]).

Regarding claim 16, Kinnunen further discloses subscribing to one or more

events (page 1 [0014]); displaying to said user said one or more event (page 1 [0016]);

and delivering to said user notification of said one or more events (page 1 [0016]).

Regarding claim 17, Kinnunen discloses a OLMN system comprising: one or

more subscribed users of said system; an integrated communications server (page 1

[0014]); wherein said users submit requests for services (page 1 [0015]). Kinnunen

differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching a presentation services

framework, said framework receiving said requests from said users; formatting said

requests from users; forwarding said requests to appropriate frameworks for further

processing; and presenting an appropriate user interface to said user. However, Baker teaches a presentation services framework, said framework receiving said requests from said users (col. 7 lines 3-13); formatting said requests from users (col. 7 lines 3-13); forwarding said requests to appropriate frameworks for further processing (col. 7 lines 3-13); and presenting an appropriate user interface to said user (col. 7 lines 3-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kinnunen in a presentation services framework, said framework receiving said requests from said users; formatting said requests from users; forwarding said requests to appropriate frameworks for further processing; and presenting an appropriate user interface to said user, as per teaching of Baker, because it provides methods and computer executable instructions for creating numeric dialing strings facilitating the wireless network dial-up session.

Regarding claim 21, Kinnunen discloses a system for creating user interfaces for a plurality of users of an OLMN, comprising: a computer-processable medium (page 1 [0014]); and logic stored on the computer-processable medium, the logic operable to receive a request from said user for service from said OLMN, said request comprising data pertaining to said service (page 1 [0014] and [0016]); to validate said data received from said request (page 1 [0016]); and to return a user interface, said user interface being appropriate for the particular request received (page 1 [0014] and [0016]). Kinnunen differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching if said data is valid for said request, to format said data into an internal format; to submit said

formatted request to an appropriate framework for application processing. However,

Baker teaches if said data is valid for said request, to format said data into an internal

format (col. 7 lines 3-13); to submit said formatted request to an appropriate framework

for application processing (col. 7 lines 3-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kinnunen

in if said data is valid for said request, to format said data into an internal format; to

submit said formatted request to an appropriate framework for application processing,

as per teaching of Baker, because it provides methods and computer executable

instructions for creating numeric dialing strings facilitating the wireless network dial-up

session.

4.   Claims 2-4, 6-13, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kinnunen et al. (U.S PUB. 2001/0021649 hereinafter, "Kinnunen") in

view of Baker et al. (U.S PAT. 6,317,597 hereinafter, "Baker") as applied to claims

above, and further in view of Singh (U.S PAT. 6,154,660).

        Regarding claim 2, Kinnunen and Baker, in combination, fails to discloses one of

said plurality of users making service requests is a PLMN operator. However, Singh

teaches one of said plurality of users making service requests is a PLMN operator (col.

2 lines 51-62). Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Singh into view of Kinnunen and

Baker, in order to provide telecommunication devices capable of utilizing multiple

incoming telephone lines, and more particularly, to a method for preselecting the

telephone lines to associate with a particular outgoing call number.

Regarding claim 3, Singh further discloses one of said plurality of users making

service requests is a corporate operator (col. 2 line 63 and col. 3 line 10).

Regarding claim 4, Singh further discloses one of said plurality of users making

service requests is a OLMN subscriber (col. 2 lines 46-50).

Regarding claim 6, Singh further discloses request is made for OAMP services

(col. 2 line 63-66); and further wherein said data pertains to system provisioning for a

subsystem of said OLMN (col. 2 lines 46-50).

Regarding claim 7, Kinnunen further discloses step of returning a user interface

further comprises returning a user interface appropriate for operations upon subsystem

managed objects (page 2 [0017]).

Regarding claim 8, Kinnunen further discloses operations comprises a group,

said group further comprising one of creation, deletion, modification and viewing said

objects (page 2 [0017]).

Regarding claim 9, Baker further discloses system provisioning data comprises data for software configuration for a subsystem (col. 4 lines 4-12).

Regarding claim 10, Baker further discloses data for software configuration further comprises data for one of a group, said group further comprising download, upload, activate, and deactivate software (col. 4 lines 13-25).

Regarding claim 11, Baker further discloses system provisioning data comprises data for subscriber provisioning (col. 4 lines 4-12).

Regarding claim 12, Kinnunen further discloses data for subscriber provisioning further comprises data for one of a group, said group further comprising create, delete, backup, schedule, restore, upload, download, and bulk upload subscriber database (page 2 [0017]).

Regarding claim 13, Baker further discloses subscriber provisioning data comprises further comprises data for one of a group, said group further comprising add, modify, view, delete, and activate subscriber (col. 4 lines 13-25).

Regarding claim 18, Singh further discloses one of more subscribed user comprises a PLMN operator (col. 2 lines 51-62).

Regarding claim 19, Singh further discloses one of more subscribed user comprises a corporate operator (col. 2 line 63 and col. 3 line 10).

Regarding claim 20, Singh further discloses one of more subscribed user comprises a OLMN subscriber (col. 2 lines 46-50).

Conclusion

13.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop_____ (Explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22313

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-8329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00Am - 5:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571)272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2643